

DAVID LOEBSACK

2ND DISTRICT, IOWA

COMMITTEES:  
ARMED SERVICES  
SUBCOMMITTEES:  
MILITARY PERSONNEL  
READINESS

EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

SUBCOMMITTEES:  
HEALTH, EMPLOYMENT, LABOR,  
AND PENSIONS

HIGHER EDUCATION AND  
WORKFORCE TRAINING

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, DC 20515-1502**

May 21, 2014

WASHINGTON OFFICE:  
1527 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515  
(202) 225-6576

DISTRICT OFFICES:  
125 SOUTH DUBUQUE STREET  
IOWA CITY, IA 52240  
(319) 351-0789

209 WEST 4TH STREET, #104  
DAVENPORT, IA 52801  
(563) 323-5388  
1 (866) 914-IOWA

541  
Received & Inspected

MAY 27 2014

FCC Mail Room

Chairman Wheeler and Commissioners  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 Twelfth Street, SW, Room 8-C453  
Washington, DC 20554


Dear Chairman Wheeler and Commissioners,

Last week, your Commission advanced a proposal regarding rules governing the open Internet. I am deeply concerned about the potential of this proposal to run afoul of a strong net neutrality policy that treats some online content differently by Internet Service Providers (ISPs).

I strongly believe that the Internet is a space and a tool that must remain equal to all users. The internet has become more than just a research tool and gathering place, it has become a necessary tool for individuals and businesses to function in our modern society and economy. In many aspects of life, we now have a system that revolves tightly around access to the Internet and its ability to perform – for things like education, commerce, medicines and healthcare, as well as completing government requirements that are increasingly moving online. For each person or businesses, each use of the internet takes on a different priority and it's critical to provide an equal playfield for all uses.

As this proposal now moves forward and into the public comment phase, it's imperative that you take all options for maintaining a strong net neutrality policy into consideration. I appreciate you soliciting comments specifically on if paid-prioritization should be banned, and I urge you to give serious consideration to reclassifying ISPs as common carriers in order to ensure strong open Internet rules. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Dave Loebsack  
Iowa's Second District



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

June 17, 2014

The Honorable Dave Loebsack  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1527 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Loebsack:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* ("Notice") adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission's review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you suggest in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* asks specific questions about Title II, including whether the Commission should 1) revisit its classification of Broadband Internet Access as an information service; or 2) separately identify and classify as a telecommunications service a service that "broadband providers . . . furnish to edge providers," as proposed by Mozilla in a May 5 Petition filed with the agency. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of



both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.


With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to concerns about paid prioritization arrangements, and the potential such arrangements have for creating an Internet that is fast for a few, and slow for everyone else. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsperson to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler